



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

contagion. In the case of Minucius Felix, however, the peculiar position of his *Octavius* in the transition from pagan to Christian Latin and its surprising dependence upon its chief source, the *De natura deorum* of Cicero, sufficiently explain the importance and the interest of such an investigation as that here presented. Ausserer finds his starting-point in the four forms which Zielinski in the well-known study *Das Klauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden* has shown to be the favorite clausulae of Cicero. To the first three of these belong approximately 95 per cent of the 679 clausulae of the *Octavius*, while the fourth is but slightly represented and a few other metrical combinations of a rather bewildering variety are also discovered.

Probably the greatest interest of this investigation is to be found in the possible light thrown upon the dark places of the readings of the one poor manuscript in which the *Octavius* has been preserved. Some seventy passages are discussed by Ausserer from this point of view, and it is noteworthy that in several instances (e.g., *labiis pressit*, chap. ii) the reading of P is preferred on metrical grounds in opposition to the emendations accepted by modern editors.

The text of Boenig has been followed in the main, while for the convenience of the reader, references are also given to the edition of Halm in the Vienna Corpus.

EDWARD A. BECHTEL

TULANE UNIVERSITY

Plato, Apology of Socrates and Crito, with Extracts from the Phaedo and Symposium and from Xenophon's Memorabilia.

Edited by LOUIS DYER, revised by THOMAS DAY SEYMOUR.

With a Vocabulary. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1908. Pp. 246.

This is a revision of the Cron-Dyer *Apology and Crito*, to which Professor Seymour has added other passages with commentary, a vocabulary, and indices. The notes have been simplified and better adapted to the needs of the American schoolboy.

The critical notes are limited to a list of the changes from Dyer's text and another list showing the deviations from the texts of notable German editions, viz., the Cron-Uhle ed. of the *Apology and Crito*, Wohlrab's *Phaedo*, Hug's *Symposium*, and the Breitenbach-Mücke ed. of the *Memorabilia*. One readily accepts the changes from Dyer's text, except the bracketing of *πάλαι Apol. 31d* which removes an effective repetition; less readily, some of the deviations from the texts of the German editors. The following readings, adopted by Seymour, are open to criticism: *Apol. 22a*, *ἴνα μοι*. The conjecture of Stephanus *ἴνα μή μοι* is now confirmed by Δ and the Armenian version. Socrates' assumed "attitude of opposition," shown in his effort to refute the oracle (*ὥς . . . ἐλέγξων 21c*), is kept up consistently in this and succeeding passages (cf.

ὡς . . . καταληψόμενος 22b).—24a, τοῖς αὐτοῖς is ill-suited to the context, whereas either Heindorf's τοῦτοις αὐτοῖς or αὐτοῖς τοῦτοις which is implied in the Arm. vers. gives the desired meaning.—26e, μὲν is unnecessary and has little support.—31b, μέντοι, though accepted by Bäumlein, does not go well with the καὶ that precedes or the δὲ that follows. Read μὲν (Cobet's conj.) with W or accept Göbel's attractive emendation καίτοι εἰ μὲν τι.—31d, ἀπολώλη, 36a, ἀποπεφύγῃ should have the augment; cf. Schanz XII, p. xii, Meisterhans 170, 6.—Crito 46a, δέ τι. Prefer δ' ἐτι; cf. ἔτι l. 24.

The commentary contains many corrections and improvements on Dyer's notes. The following points, however, may be criticized: 25b, τοῦναντίον πᾶν. It is somewhat better to explain this as being in apposition with the following sentence than as an adverbial accusative. The same is true in 34a, where it is not the object of εἰρήσετε, as the punctuation would seem to indicate.—26d, ὥστ' οὐκ εἰδέναι. οὐ is due to the indirect discourse, as Professor Gildersleeve showed in his review of Dyer (*AJP* VI 523; cf. VII 174, XXI 110). Yet S. still keeps most of Dyer's note.—27d, τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη. φάναι is not "appended" to the relative clause. It explains τοῦτο the subject, not the relative clause which is the predicate.—35c, ὁμώμοκεν οὐ χαριεῖσθαι. οὐ does not go with the inf., as S. thinks, but with ὁμώμοκεν (cf. *AJP* I 49). S. finds οὐ in the dicasts' oath (οὔτε χάριτος ἔνεκα) and believes that this οὐ is retained here in indir. disc. But "ὁμνυμι . . . is perfectly steady" in taking μή after it. Since this and other negatives are discussed, a note is needed on "oracular" μή 21a, deliberative μή 22e, and οὐ in a protasis 34c (εἰ=ὄτι).—41b, ἄγοντα. S.'s note to the effect that "extreme accuracy [in the use of tenses] is not aimed at" here, is hard to understand; cf. his "indifferent" in the note on 26d 22. ἄγοντα="who was the leader of," the durative tense causing the mind to dwell on the exercise of the office of leader. ἀγαρόντα which most editors adopt is simply "who led."—Crito 44c, ὡς οἶός τ' ὦν. The participle expresses cause or ground of belief, not concession.—49e, δίκαια ὄντα, 50a, δικαίοις οὔσιν. No notice is taken of Professor Shorey's note (*CJ* II 80) in which he shows plainly that these participles are not supplementary but circumstantial, that they do not take the place of the usual inf. in indir. disc. after ὁμολογεῖν, as Goodwin, Kühner-Gerth, and Stahl think, but denote limitation or condition.

Some small errors have been noted: P. 7, l. 35, *Phidippides* for *Strepsiades*; p. 43, 19 note, omit ἐστὶ or the note that follows it; p. 49, 8 n., σοφὸς for σοφόν; p. 56, 1 n., 22d for 21b; p. 117, 32 n., *fin.* for *init.*; p. 194, changes from Dyer's text at 28d 30 and 31d 12 have been omitted; pp. 194-5, omissions occur in the other list at 23d 14, 27e 34, 31d 13, 33e 25, 36a 7, 41b 37.

CHARLES W. PEPPLER